DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 395 FL 016 635

AUTHOR Ingram, D. E.
TITLE Language Policy and Economic and Social Development.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the RELC Regional Language Seminar on the Role of Language Education in Human Resource Development (Singapore, April 13-16, 1987).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Applied Linguistics; Correlation; *Economic Development; Educational Assessment; Foreign Countries; International Education; International Trade; *Labor Force Development; *Language Role; Language Tests; *Language Usage; Official Languages; *Policy Formation; Program Implementation; *Public Policy; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; Language Policy

ABSTRACT

A discussion of language policy making and its place in a nation's economic and social development uses Australia's experience as a case study. In particular, it reviews the factors such as multiculturalism and international relations that have led to the development of a national language policy, and examines the interim documents and the national policy expected to be released in early 1987. Particular attention is given to the role of language in economic development, a probable link between the decline in Australia's language education system and its economic security, and the role of improved language education in economic revival. The importance of a valid, reliable, and readily accessible means of language skills assessment in full and fair development of human resources is emphasized. Finally, the role of language education in Australia's present drive to develop education as an export commodity is considered, focusing on the response of one of the country's largest Colleges of Advanced Education to the export of education, the needs of the Asian-Pacific region, and the critical role of expertise in applied linguistics. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED282395

LANGUAGE POLICY AND ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

D.E. Ingram
Head, Language Teaching Unit and
Office for International Students,
Brisbane College of Advanced Education,
Mount Gravatt Campus, Mount Gravatt,
Queensland, Australia.

Paper to the 1987 RELC Regional Language Seminar,
"The Role of Language Education in Human Resource Development",
SEAMEO RELC Centre, Singapore, 13-16 April, 1987.

Dr. Ingram is national President of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (AFMLTA) and world Vice-President of the Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes (FIPLV).

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Ingram

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL016635

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Language Policy and Economic and Social Development

D.E. Ingram

This paper considers the nature of language policy-making and its place in a nation's economic and social development using Australia as a case study. In particular, it reviews the factors that have led to the development of a national language policy in Australia (especially the effect of multiculturalism and international relations) and reviews the interim documents and the national language policy expected to be released in February 1987. The paper gives particular attention to the role of language in economic development, demonstrates a probable link between the decline in Australia's language education system and its economic security, and considers the role of improved language education in economic revival. It emphasizes, inter alia, the importance of a valid, reliable and readily accessible means of assessment if available human resources are to be fully and fairly developed and used. Finally the paper considers the role of language education in Australia's present drive to develop education as an export commodity and exemplifies what is occurring with a brief discussion of the response being made by one of Australia's largest Colleges of Advanced Education to the export of education, to the needs of the Asian-Pacific region, and to the critical role of expertise in applied linguistics if that response is to be successful.

CONTENTS

Abstract

I Introduction

II Nature of a National Language Policy

III Factors Leading to a National Language Policy in Australia

III.1 Social and International Factors
III.2 The Present Language Education System
III.3 Languages and Exports
III.4 Development of a National Language Policy in Australia

IV Language Skills in Human Resource Development: Selected Aspects

V Conclusion

Appendix A Excerpts from the AFMLTA's Submission on a National Language Policy [AFMLTA 1982]

Appendix B Excerpts from A National Language Policy.

References

I INTRODUCTION:

This paper considers the role of language in a nation's economic and social development by considering, in particular, the structure and nature of a coherent and comprehensive national language policy and considering Australia as a case study in which the social and national needs that have led to the development of a national language policy and the emerging policy itself are reviewed.

II NATURE OF A NATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY:

In preparing the submission of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations to the 1982-84 enquiry into a national language policy for Australia conducted by the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts [AFMLTA 1982], the present writer argued that a coherent, rational and justified national language policy must have as its starting-point the nature of the society and its corollary needs, these being considered

- internally (i.e. in terms of the current structure of the society, the languages used within it, and their roles);
- internationally (i.e. in terms of the nation's international roles and relationships and their language implications);
- currently (i.e. in terms of the current structure and needs of the society); and
- futuristically (i.e. in terms of the society's long-term development).

In the context of a society such as Australia which had traditionally, even if falsely, seen itself as monolingual and monocultural, this last, the futuristic perspective, raises issues of both purpose and method in policy-making some of which may seem trivial in other culturally and linguistically diverse societies but have been contentious in Australia. Not least, language policy-making that seeks to respond to future development needs takes on aspects of "social engineering" and this, at least at the popular level in Australia, has frequently been used as an argument against the development of language and multicultural policies. However, since, first, no living culture is static, it seems clearly desirable that planning occur in order to enable social and cultural evolution to take place in as enriching a manner as possible by drawing on all the available linguistic and cultural resources; in particular, planning is needed to facilitate the maintenance of the society's languages and cultures and to encourage their interaction. Second, "social engineering" in the sense of taking decisions that lead to a particular developmental path in a society rather than another is an inevitable part of any political system, occurs every time a government takes a decision, and is both well illustrated and publicly expected in the economic area. In the context of national language policy-making in a democratic society, social

engineering may be less defensible if its goals were specified definitively and imposed but it is entirely appropriate if the policy-making seeks to enable present and future needs to be met, to maintain and develop existing resources, and to create both the freedom and any needed attitudinal change that will enable the society's cultures to interact and evolve in their own way. In other words, rational language policy-making contrasts with social engineering (in the sense of engineering and imposing more or less arbitrary social reforms from above) in that it sets and pursues social goals by meeting identifiable needs, maintaining resources, and fostering the freedom, equality and mutual respect that allows cultures to interact and evolve. Third, language, both within a society and internationally, is a pre-requisite key to knowledge, resources and power. [cf. Teague 1985: 4-5] and the failure of governments to give due regard to language means, in multilingual societies, that sections of the society will be denied access to all three; internationally, it means that, if a nation neglects to develop its skills in other languages or is denied access to them by other nations, it will be deprived of the knowledge (including modern technology) developed elsewhere, it will be unable to communicate effectively with other nations or will depend on their willingness to communicate with it, and, as we shall see happened in Australia, it will become progressively less effective in international trade and diplomacy. Fourth, because, in most modern societies, the economy is regulated, unless language policies are overt and explicit, resources cannot or will not be allocated. Fifth, language policy-making need not be external to and imposed on the society but can emphasize the participation of the people. At the national level in Australia, this occurred in the first half of the 1980's by a process of encouraging public debate, by calling for written and oral submissions to a Senate enquiry (which action generated a vast number of public and private meetings and conferences called by organizations at organizational, local, State and national levels) and, by using the parliamentary processes, in which the ultimate policy-makers are answerable to the people through the ballot-box.

Nevertheless, despite this emphasis on policy-making being public and involving the people, it should not merely reflect what the people as a whole are currently demanding since this would, in a reasonably democratic system, probably make it largely redundant. Rather, a national language policy should constitute an overview of the society, provide a perspective that individuals caught in the present web of the society may be unable to see, identify present and future trends and needs, and consider reasoned alternatives for the society's future development and anticipated needs. This implies a delicate balance in the policy-making process between the external imposition of a social structure and sensitivity to public opinion and immediate needs; however, without a future orientation, practical needs cannot be met simply because it takes time and resources to change educational and other services and, if planning is too much entangled in the web of the present, it rapidly becomes redundant and its services irrelevant. This is illustrated in Australia by the difficulties that have been experienced for the last 15 or more years in changing from a French-German-based language teaching system to one that is more diverse and more closely reflects Australia's current social and international needs. In brief, the balance away from arbitrary social engineering is restored by careful examination of the nature and needs

of the society and the predictable changes in its structure and relationships, by involving the people in the policy-making process in the ways discussed earlier, by publicly arguing the developed policy, and by establishing the formal structures that enable the evolving policy to be monitored, evaluated, amended and developed.

These considerations also have implications for the form and presentation of a national language policy. Thus, the first and most fundamental questions that must be considered in developing a national language policy concern the present nature of the society and its needs and what the nation wants the society to become, i.e., a policy must identify and state explicitly the present and future **needs** and the **goals and objectives** to be sought.

Policy-makers not infrequently stop at this stage and, indeed, this has characteristically occurred in Australian language policy-making at both the national and State levels [see, for example, SSCEA 1984]. Policy is of little value unless it can be implemented, amended in the light of unforeseen needs or new insights, and evaluated and revised. Consequently, a comprehensive and coherent national language policy must be specific on how the ideals are to be implemented and the policy monitored, evaluated and continually revised.

Implementation proposals should indicate quite explicitly how the policy statements are to be implemented and the goals and objectives attained: pious words are not enough. It is not enough, for instance, for a policy to support the notion of language maintenance and increased second language learning: if it is to succeed, it must propose concrete ways in which language offerings will be expanded, teachers selected, trained and appointed, materials developed, and students attracted into courses. Implementation recommendations are needed on how a policy is to be administered, monitored, evaluated, and further researched and elaborated. Thus, appropriate administrative structures must be identified together with, if necessary, a national body charged with oversighting the policy.

Evaluation is a necessary element of a national language policy to ensure that it is being implemented, the goals and objectives being attained, and the needs met. The policy will also require adjustment as the language situation within the society and the international relationships change or as new insights occur in the linguistic sciences. This on-going monitoring and evaluation process is thus essential if the policy is to remain responsive to changing or newly identified needs and if the resource allocations required to support the policy are to be appropriate.

This approach to developing and presenting language policy is applicable at any level of language or language education policy-making (national, State, local or school). Conscientiously applied, it ensures rigour in the policy-making process, not least by ensuring that otherwise empty ideals are both rationally justified and implementable and, when implemented, are monitored and evaluated and it helps to ensure that the policy is explicit, integrated, coherent and rational. It is not the form taken by the various national or State language or language education policies that have been published in Australia in recent years and this lack is reflected in their failure to adequately

demonstrate how the policy is to be implemented or what resource allocation is to be made and, in whole or in part, tend to consist of praiseworthy ideals and linguistically pious words that leave, for example, actual educational practice largely unaffected. The approach argued here is, however, reflected in the submission made by the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations [1982] to the inquiry into a national language policy for Australia conducted by the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts [SSCEA 1984]. The AFMLTA submission established the policy content by decribing the society and its developmental trends both overall and in each section (these coinciding with the areas of the inquiry's terms of reference) and then presented the policy and implementation proposals in tabular format using six columns headed respectively

Needs (Societal and Individual)
Goals and Objectives
Policy Recommendations
Implementation Proposals
Rationale (i.e. the theoretical justification for the first four columns)
Indicators of Success (i.e., how the policy is to be evaluated).

This appproach is illustrated in Appendix A containing two excerpts from the AFMLTA submission.

III FACTORS LEADING TO A NATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY IN AUSTRALIA:

The need for a more rational, explicit and comprehensive approach to language and language education policy-making in Australia has become increasingly acute during the last 15 to 20 years especially as a result of acceptance of a multiracial, multicultural and multilingual model for Australian society and as a result of marked changes in Australia's international trade and diplomatic relationships. These factors, changes in Australian society and in Australia's international orientation, have not been accompanied by changes of comparable magnitude in language education with the result that a serious, I would argue catastrophic [Ingram 1986], mismatch has occurred between demonstrable need, language resources, and the language education system with, amongst other things, a profoundly damaging effect on the Australian economy.

III.1 Social and International Factors:

Socially, linguistic and cultural diversity have characterized Australia since its pre-history though, for the first 70 years of this century, social policies were founded in the view that the nation was white, monocultural and monolingual. The then Prime Minister is quoted as saying in 1949 that the society sought was

> "...the ideal of one Australian family devoid of foreign communities, thus preserving our homogeneity and solidarity as a nation." [Quoted in Martin 1972:14]

Since the early 1970's, all State and Federal governments and all significant political parties have accepted a policy of multiculturalism in which national identity and unity are seen as incorporating racial, cultural and linguistic pluralism. The many reports and policies are summed up in the Galbally Review which stated in 1978:

> "...every person should be able to maintain his or her culture without prejudice or disadvantage and should be encouraged to understand and embrace other cultures...
>
> "We reject the argument that cultural diversity necessarily creates divisiveness...
>
> "...the cultural and racial differences...must be reflected in education programs designed to foster inter-cultural and inter-racial understanding." [Galbally Review 1978:4,105]

In fact, it is estimated that some 250 languages are spoken daily in Australia including about 150 Aboriginal languages [for figures cited in this paragraph, see AFMLTA 1982, Teague 1985, SSCEA 1984:189]. Census figures show that, in 1983, 82.9% of the population first spoke English while 17.3% first spoke another language. It is estimated that at least one in five Australians use a language other than English in the course of their daily activity and many more have some form of emotional affiliation with other languages. Apart from English, the most numerous languages spoken in Australia are Italian, Greek and German, while some 18 languages have 11,000 or more speakers. In addition to English and Aboriginal languages, Australia's languages originate from all parts of the world, especially Europe and Asia. The recent cause of this linguistic diversity has been the immigration programme as a result of which, since World War II, about 20% of the population has originated from overseas. The annual migrant intake averages approximately 100,000 though current figures considerably exceed this and are expected to re-gain the previous peak year of 180,000 in the near future. In other words, the diversity of Australian languages is more likely to increase than decrease with the actual pattern of languages changing as the focus of migration changes.

Internationally, Australia's orientation has shifted markedly from English-speaking and European countries to non-English-L1, non-European countries [for data in this paragraph, see SSCEA 1984; Yearbook Australia 1985: Chapters 5, 6, 26; EPAC 1986; Commonwealth Advisory Committee 1970:11-16]. In 1951-5, 52% of Australian exports went to

English-speaking countries and 48% to non-English-speaking whereas, in 1984, the percentages were respectively 25% and 75% [EPAC 1986:9]. In 1951-5, 79% of Australian exports went to English-speaking or European countries with 21% going elsewhere whereas, by 1978-82, these had become respectively 37% and 63% [EPAC 1986:9-10]. In other activities such as diplomacy, defence, tourism and aid, Australia's international re-orientation has been at least as great from, previously, predominantly English-speaking countries (especially Britain, New Zealand and North America) to Asian and Pacific countries where English is not the principal first language. Australia has established numerous bilateral and multilateral cultural, defence and other "mutual understanding and friendship" treaties with many other but predominantly non-English-L1 countries; it has sought to establish itself as a "middle power" in the Asian-Pacific region; it provided aid in 1984-5 to some 80 largely non-English-L1 countries in the Pacific, Asia, Africa and the Middle East; it has established diplomatic and consular links with some 120 mainly non-English-L1 countries; and its overseas visitor intake has risen to approximately one million with a rapidly increasing proportion (currently a little under a half) from non-English-L1 countries.

III.2 The Present Language Education System:

The system for the teaching of languages other than English in Australia is complex. Though the main avenue for language learning is through the formal education system (Primary and Secondary Schools, Colleges and Universities), other avenues include the extensive ethnic school system, extension classes (including government-funded afternoon and Saturday language schools), and a few private language schools. Despite a proliferation of languages available with more than 30 different languages being taught in formal Primary and Secondary Schools and many more in ethnic schools [Commonwealth Department of Education 1986:16-18], the overall picture is bleak with strong evidence that Australia's real needs are not being met. The best and most recent figures available [Commonwealth Department of Education 1986] show that, in 1983, only 34.1% of children took a language in Secondary School and only 11.9% in upper Secondary. 90% of Primary Schools offered no language at all (other then English), only 11.7% of students from homes where a language other than English was spoken were studying that home language in school, and half of all Australian students never experience the learning of any other language but English. In addition to being inadequate in size, the language education system is defective in orientation with the pattern of languages taught (or at least their relative proportions) failing to reflect both the nation's linguistic diversity and its international orientation. Thus, in 1961 when Australia's ties were with Europe, the 43% of Secondary students studying a language learned predominantly French

with some Latin and German and very small numbers learning Italian, Hebrew, Greek, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and Indonesian [Wykes and King 1968:75-76]. By 1983, some 30 languages were being taught in Primary and Secondary Schools but French, German and Italian (with the small enrolments of 7.45%, 4.58% and 4.13% of all students) far exceeded the languages of the region and of Australia's trading partners such as Indonesian (.88%), Japanese (.61%), Chinese (.13%), and Arabic (.11%) [Commonwealth Department of Education 1986:16-18]. Universities match the needs no more adequately since 59% of the small proportion (7%) of their students taking a language took one or more of French, German and Italian while fewer than a quarter took Japanese, Indonesian, Chinese and Greek [SSCEA 1984:167].

In the area of English as a second language, despite a very large adult and child migrant education system and despite programmes that have at times been highly innovative in methodology, course design and assessment, the overall picture is also far from satisfactory. While it is recognized that "lack of fluency in English is the major barrier to effective participation in Australian society" [1980 Report of the Australian Institute for Multicultural Affairs, p.12], the key indicators reveal massive unmet needs:

- as many as one in five school students are classified as potentially in need of ESL assistance though the actual figure is unclear;
- 50% of those students classified as needing ESL assistance received it for less than 11% of school time and 79% for less than 26% of school time;
- many non-native English speaking students drop out prematurely and fail to reach their educational potential;
- of 300,000 adults identified in 1984 as having inadequate English, only about 62,000 actually participated in an ESL program in 1984-85 [Campbell et al 1984: Chapter 5 and 1986:51-52].

The area of English as a Foreign Language has been grossly under-developed and, in fact, it was only in 1969 that the first EFL classes for Asian students were started in Australia [SSCEA 1984: Chapter 7] though support for EFL in other countries had been given through the aid budget. However, it has been only since the mid-1980's with a relaxation of student visa regulation that the Australian Government has seriously encouraged government-funded institutions and private organizations to offer EFL classes for foreign students.

Beyond the language-learning system, many needs remain either unrecognized or unmet but, here, just two will be mentioned. First, despite significant improvement in translating and interpreting services since the formation of the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI) in 1977, the availability of properly trained translators and interpreters remains seriously inadequate while many organizations (including government departments, law courts and medical services) fail to recognize the need to use qualified people or, in the case of international negotiations, qualified Australians [see SSCEA 1984: Chapter 12, Ingram 1986]. Second, there is serious need for more adequate approaches to language testing, especially language proficiency assessment, for many purposes from streaming into the education system to assessing legal liability to vocational registration. In vocational areas, practice varies from the use of defective and inappropriate tests (such as that of the Australian Medical Examining Council) to an equally discriminatory ignoring of the problem with the result that non-native English speakers either are effectively excluded from practising their vocation or rapidly fail in it. In the area of teacher registration, for instance, only the Queensland Board of Teacher Education attempts to assess the English proficiency of overseas-trained applicants for teacher registration and to either accept them or advise them on how to improve their English; elsewhere the problem is either ignored with the result that teachers with inadequate English rapidly drop out of teaching or applicants are forced to re-train unnecessarily or are rejected unless their English is obviously close to native-like. There is urgent need for a better informed approach to language testing and, desirably, for a system of accredited language assessors [see Section IV below and Ingram 1985].

III.3 Languages and Exports:

Although a national language policy has not yet, even in March 1987 when this paper is being written, been promulgated, it is evident from the preceding discussion that a de facto policy has been in place, that it has (as in the Galbally 1978 quote above and in the first report on the teaching of Asian languages in Australia in 1970 [Commonwealth Advisory Committee 1970]) sought to recognize the importance of language skills economically, as part of Australians' cultural heritages, and in terms of equality of status and opportunity for all Australians. However, since it has been piecemeal and has often been stronger on ideals than implementation [e.g. SSCEA 1984], the actual practical language reality has fallen far short of meeting real needs. There have been many papers and reports in the last 15 years that have highlighted the needs and possibilities that arise from Australia's proportionately large immigration programme and its policy of multiculturalism [e.g. Galbally Review

1978, Campbell et al 1984 and 1986, Bostock 1973, Department of Education 1976, Martin 1972, Schools Commission 1978, Ingram 1978, 1979, 1980, 1980a, 1984]. Here another effect of the inchoate state of Australian language policy-making will be considered, the effect on the export economy.

We noted earlier that changes in the language education system have failed to keep pace with changes in Australia's international relationships and especially in the pattern of trade. In fact, the present language education system is too small and too inappropriate to be able either to meet the direct needs that arise from Australia's international relations and trading patterns or to provide within Australia those pools of understanding of other nations that are vital if her policies, products and negotiations are to be relevant to the nations with whom she deals and to whom she must sell. It is also too restricted and too inappropriate even to provide a pool of administrators sensitive to the vital importance of language skills and cross-cultural understanding and sufficient to leaven Australian diplomacy, bureaucracy and management. Bostock 1973 provides a well-argued case in support of this view, the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Asian languages and cultures in 1970 found Australian businessmen in general singularly unaware of the need to employ staff fluent in Asian languages and with an understanding of Asian cultures [Commonwealth Advisory Committee 1970: 17-21], and the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts in 1983 received submissions from various Federal Government Departments (including Foreign Affairs, Trade and Immigration) to the effect that they were unable to recruit sufficient Australians with language skills to meet their needs - the conservative figures they provided indicated a shortfall of almost 70% [SSCEA 1984: 128]. The tourism industry has now become so concerned with the problem that, through the recently formed Asian Studies Council, it is financially supporting a project to provide intensive courses in Japanese language and culture to its employees in public contact positions.

However, the problem goes beyond a simple lack of language skills within the society. In fact, the vast numbers of people proficient in other languages recruited as migrants are in most cases prevented from using their other language or languages as a vocational skill. The Australian Bureau of Statistics has published figures that show that, in May 1983, 3.2 million (28%) of the 11.3 million Australians over 15 years of age claimed to have a language besides English, 16.8% had learned it as their first language, 16.3% had learned it as a second or foreign language, and quite high percentages (92.7% and 76.8% respectively) claimed they still used it socially or at home [Cameron 1983]. In other words, again, the problem is not solely a question of there being a lack of skills available but also a failure on the part of bureaucrats, managers and others in decision-making positions to perceive the needs, demand adequate and appropriate skills from the education system, and use those available. This is

exemplified in the following facts, most of which were cited in the AFMLTA's submission on a national language policy [AFMLTA 1982: Section II.2]:

1. Often when Australians are assigned to overseas posts, no account is taken of their language skills. Thus, a Greek-speaking couple, friends of the present writer, were assigned to an Embassy post in Greece but, before departure, were re-assigned to Paris though they had no French and had to take a short pre-departure course. Soon after, they were moved to Austria though they had no German and then to Poland though they had no Polish.

2. Reports have appeared in the press concerning the way in which reliance on local or other non-Australian translators whose loyalties naturally lie with their own country has, on occasions, led Australian Embassy staff and, therefore, the Australian policy-makers to being deceived. Bostock [1973] has shown how this practice had a profound impact on Australian foreign policy in the 1960's.

3. In 1982, the present writer was a member of a small aid project team advising the Australian and Chinese governments on an English language teacher training project in Beijing, China. The team did not include a speaker of Chinese, was not provided with an interpreter, and had to rely on interpreters provided by the Chinese authorities. One of these interpreters eventually admitted that he translated only so much of the Australian questions as he thought appropriate and only so much of the Chinese replies as he thought would convince the Australian team that the project should proceed. Probably most Australian aid and trade delegations are similarly ill-equipped linguistically and can be no more confident of the information given and received through interpreters whose first loyalty, naturally again, lies other than with Australia.

4. The Australian newspaper on 24 April, 1986 carried reports of how Australian participation in a recent world wool conference in Madrid was significantly impeded because no Australian interpreter or translator was available either to the delegation or from the Australian Embassy, documents could not be translated into Spanish, and the only interpreter facilities the delegation could obtain were from young tour guides with little English and no technical knowledge. One of the Australian

delegates referred to similar problems at an earlier conference in Japan and it seems highly probable that the same situation arises during most conferences and missions in which Australians are involved. Significantly, the newspaper report indicated that the South African delegation at the Madrid conference was accompanied by a technical aide fluent in English, Spanish, Italian, German and French.

5. In 1981, the Modern Language Teachers Association of Queensland wrote to all trade-related Federal and Queensland Government Departments to elicit their attitudes and practices in the language area. Those of Queensland were exemplified in the following excerpts from the then Minister for Primary Industries:

> "(i) My Department has not conducted any surveys in connection with the language needs of officers working overseas...
>
> (iii) To date we have not found it necessary to make use of the services of an interpreter or arrange translation of documents when receiving overseas delegations here in Queensland.
>
> (iv) If the services of an interpreter are required when officers are overseas... they are normally arranged by the host country or organisation.
>
> (v) No preference is given in our staff recruitment policy to persons with skills in languages other then English." [MLTAQ Newsletter, No. 47, August 1981: 5-11].

With such attitudes rampant in business, industry and the bureaucracy, it is not surprising that Australia's export economy should seem to be in desperate straits. Recently, in deploring complacency in Australian economic life, the Federal Minister for Industry, Technology and Science, Senator John Button, called for basic reforms in the Australian education system and "a far greater effort to understand the region at the language and cultural level" [see Kelly 1986: 15]; the Minister for Science, Mr Barry Jones, laid the blame for Australian manufacturers' failing to capitalize on developments in South East Asia on their failure to read and be aware of new technology and on Australians' increasing failure to speak the languages of their major trading partners [see The Advertiser, 19 June, 1986 and Français je t'aime, No. 3, June 1986, p.31]; while the Minister for Trade, Mr John Dawkins, deplored the

reluctance of Australian business "to accept that the focus of economic dynamism was shifting to Asia" and went on:

> "Once again, as a nation, we are in danger of being an also-ran...Our own conservatism, our anglophilia, our cultural myopia, indeed our racism, could again be our undoing." [Cited in Kelly 1986].

The reasons for the link between languages and the export economy are readily evident [see Ingram 1986 where they are spelt out more fully]. If a nation aspires to improve its export economy, the most fundamental issue is whether people in other countries want or can be persuaded to buy its products. It would, in fact, seem axiomatic that, if a nation wishes to influence other people, to convince them to adopt certain policies, or to persuade them to buy certain goods, then the essential starting-point is to accommodate to them, to speak their languages, to understand their views, to match the product (whether ideas or goods) to their needs, to establish close personal relationships with their negotiators, and to promote the product in the commercially most effective language, viz. the one the customer speaks. These things are possible only if government departments, agencies and companies contain people at all stages from design to production, promotion, and negotiation who speak the languages of the clients and thoroughly understand their cultures. In fact, representatives of the Confederation of Australian Industry and of the Department of Trade conceded in evidence to the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts that, "if Australian businessmen and trade commissioners were fluent in other languages", Australian trade would benefit [see SSCEA 1984: 127]. Such a belief is, in fact, entrenched in the policies and practices not only of Australia's main markets but also of its competitors [see Ingram 1986, Section 4 where this claim is elaborated; see also Council of Chief State School Officers 1986, Council of Europe Council of Ministers 1982, Federation of British Industries 1962 and 1964, Inman 1986, Perkins 1979, Simon 1980].

In addition to the direct reasons already mentioned for seeing a link between languages and the economy (suitability of the product, effectiveness of promotion, and effectiveness of the trade negotiations), there are strong indirect reasons that, if accepted, have even more profound implications for the education system if a nation is to be economically viable. These relate, in particular, to the contribution of language study to the enhancement of the intellectual processes, cognitive flexibility and creativity that underlie all human activity, not least commercial and industrial policy-making, development and marketing. In fact, Australia compares most unfavourably with other developed nations in trade in what the Economic Planning Advisory Council [1986: 15] terms "elaborately transformed manufactures" (ETM's), i.e., products which require innovation, skill, and

technological strength and which reflect, at the people's level, intellect, cognitive flexibility and creativity. Whereas more than half the world's trade is in manufactured goods, only 20% of Australia's exports are in manufactures while, of these, only 55% are ETM's compared with 80% of world trade. In fact, it seems that Australia is only 21st out of 23 OECD countries in what Ellyard terms "brain-based" products [Ellyard 1985]. If a nation is to be competitive, it must be innovative, it must produce products that are not only needed by the rest of the world but are different from those available elsewhere and superior to them in every aspect from efficiency of production, to effectiveness of marketing, to the quality and suitability of the product itself. If a nation's performance is to be improved in this way, then it must be realized, as the U.S. President's Commission realized, that it is the nation's "intellectual and psychological strengths" that are critical [see Perkins 1979: 457]. Inventiveness, creativity, and the quality of thought in policy-making, scientific, industrial, and commercial research, and management are of fundamental importance, are not merely adventitious, but are the product of effective education systems designed to maximize academic attainment but also to stimulate the development of such features as creativity and cognitive flexibility. Ellyard has stated:

> "...the key words which will determine [Australia's] economic future are our creativity, our inventiveness, our innovativeness, our entrepreneurship, and our management and organizational capacities... It is the education system...which will need to be a most critical component of our future economic and social development." [Ellyard 1985: 1]

There has, in fact, over the last decade been a rapidly multiplying mass of empirical as well as theoretical evidence that bilingualism and the experience of learning another language have highly beneficial effects on general cognitive development, creativity, cognitive flexibility, first language development, general educational attainment, and cross-cultural understanding and attitudes; the weight of evidence is now beyond dispute that those children who learn another language score more favourably in all these areas than their monolingual peers and that benefit reflects the quality and extent of their exposure to second language learning [see, for example, Swain and Cummins 1979, D'Anglejan and Tucker 1971, Ure 1980, Hancock 1977, Landry 1973 and 1974, Di Pietro 1980, Samuels and Griffore 1979, Titone 1978].

Possibly the largest body of evidence in favour of this view has been accumulated in long-term studies of the many French immersion programmes in Canada [see Swain and Cummins 1979 and, in summary form, Ingram 1980a: 12-14]. More recently, other longitudinal studies have been conducted with equally

significant results. To take just two such studies, the Louisiana Department of Education compared matched groups of elementary school students and found that those who took a second language scored significantly higher on the 1985 Basic Skills Language Arts Test and also in Mathematics [see ACTFL Newsletter, Vol.V, No.4 July, 1986] while Fradd [1982], like Landry in his earlier studies [1973, 1974], found that learning another language had a decisive and favourable impact on cognitive development including divergent thinking, cognitive flexibility, and creativity [see also de Avila et al 1981]. Such studies have implications for a nation's international competitiveness since major factors in such competitiveness would seem likely to include the creativity, cognitive flexibility and educational and intellectual development of its people and these studies suggest that an education system wishing to maximize these qualities should ensure that all children experience the benefits of learning at least one other language.

For politicians, at least in Australia, the notion of improved language education as a vital if not unique factor in economic recovery is unpalatable because it is longer term and lacks the immediacy, public prominence and flagellistic satisfaction of excise duties and cuts to salaries and working conditions. Yet the dramatic economic progress of European and Asian nations that have emphasized the need to foster their language skills and the economic (especially export) crisis that confronts nations such as Australia that have neglected those skills help to justify the claim that language skills and the corollary ability to understand and communicate effectively with trading partners are indispensable if a nation is to compete internationally.

Australia is awakening perhaps later than other nations to the linguistic reality that underlies economic success because, in the economically halcyon days to the mid-1960's when it saw itself as an English-speaking (even British) outpost separated only by an accident of distance from the English-speaking world with which it identified and to which it sold its products, it could ignore other languages. Since then, however, changes in Australia's demographic structure and international orientation have changed dramatically the pattern of language use and language needs in Australia. Regrettably, the language education system and the provision of other language services have failed to match these changes or to meet the corollary needs with, consequently, first, a strong feeling in the so-called "ethnic communities" that their linguistic and cultural heritages are being ignored and their distinctive contribution to Australia minimized; second, with an arguably catastrophic effect on the Australian economy [see Ingram 1986]; and, third, with an acutely felt need (at least within the language professions) for the total picture of language resources, needs and education to be reviewed and an explicit, comprehensive and coherent national language policy to be developed and implemented.

III.4 Development of a National Language Policy in Australia:

The first significant public statement calling for a national language policy in Australia was given at the 1978 Conference of the Modern Language Teachers Association of South Australia [i.e. Ingram 1978]. The issue was then taken up by the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (AFMLTA) and eventually by other national and State bodies involved in languages and linguistics and, perhaps most significantly in view of their political influence, by the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council and the Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia (FECCA). At the same time, AFMLTA also canvassed the possibility of a national language information and research centre (analogous to the Center for Applied Linguistics in the United States and the Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research in Britain), a clearly related issue especially as it would be the desirable body to implement and monitor a national language policy [Ingram 1978b]. Eventually, in May 1982, the matter of "The Development and Implementation of a Coordinated Language Policy for Australia" was referred by the Australian Senate to its Standing Committee on Education and the Arts. The terms of reference included an examinatiion of the adequacy of existing policies, practices, attitudes, resource allocations, and programmes in order to appropriately develop Australia's language resources. A specific requirement was to examine all aspects of a national language policy, including the role of English as a first and second language; the use of languages in the community; Aboriginal and immigrant languages; language needs arising from trade, diplomacy, defence, tourism and cultural exchange; the teaching and learning of languages; the languages of the deaf and others with disabiltiies; adult illiteracy; and information needs. The Committee called for submissions and actively encouraged interested organizations to hold local, State and national workshops and conferences on the issue and eventually received some 230 written submissions and about 100 oral submissions from several hundred witnesses [SSCEA 1984: 235-246; Teague 1985: 4]. The Committee's report entitled A National Language Policy was released in December 1984. Since then, despite persistent lobbying by AFMLTA, FECCA and other interested bodies, the document languished until, in July 1986, the Federal Minister for Education appointed Joe Lo Bianco to prepare a government response expected to be the definitive national language policy. Lo Bianco's paper was circulated to all relevant State and Federal Ministers and the Federal Government's response is now expected by mid-1987.

The report of the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts [1984] calls itself "A National Language Policy". Its fifteen chapters seek to be comprehensive and to comment on all aspects of language use and language learning in Australia. It avoids the deficiencies of earlier reports

which focussed on one issue (e.g., the needs of migrants in the context of multiculturalism or the proximity of Asia in the context of language learning) and recognizes the diversity of languages, language use, and reasons for language learning. Its chapters consider the scope of a national language policy, language use in Australia, English, teaching English as a first, second, and foreign language, adult illiteracy, Aboriginal languages, the handicapped, international relationships, teaching languages other than English, translating and interpreting, libraries, and languages in the media. In presentation, it reflects the views of the hundreds of people who made submissions to the inquiry. Its particular strengths lie in its comprehensiveness, the sensitivity of the Committee to the importance of first and second language skills and language learning, and the relative idealism that permeates the report. Looking towards implementation and on-going development of the national language policy, the report recommends the setting-up of a National Advisory Council on Language Policy together with various Coordinating Committees below it to advise in particular areas [SSCEA 1984: 52, 78]. Though the report is too long and too detailed for its contents to be outlined in this paper, Appendix B lists, as an example of the report's approach, the recommendations on the teaching of languages other than English. In brief, the report has many commendable features, it identifies many areas of need, expresses many of the language-related ideals that must underlie a coherent policy of multiculturalism, and its recommendation for a National Advisory Council provides a means by which to ensure that the policy would not be static but would be implemented, monitored and developed. Nevertheless, as a national language policy, the report has serious deficiencies.

The discussion earlier on the nature of a national language policy suggests that an adequate policy will be responsive to the people's needs, comprehensive, rationally argued, idealistic but implementable and with clear indications as to how it is to be implemented, monitored, evaluated and continually reviewed and amended. The document of the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts fills some of these criteria but it is not rationally argued, implementation receives scant attention, and there is little attention given to on-going monitoring and development. It contains many admirable ideals but it fails to go beyond this to become a coherent, integrated and structured policy. Instead of starting from the nature of the society and its needs, drawing on social and linguistic research and insights, and building a rational policy, the report is a collection of the views of the witnesses often with little or no comment or justification and little attempt to fit them into a rational and more objective policy framework or even to rebut inaccuracies. In other words, as a report bringing together the views of a cross-section of Australian society, it is quite admirable but as a reasoned, integrated policy that can be

defended or criticized against more objective criteria, it is deficient.

Perhaps the most serious deficiency is the scant attention paid to the implementation, monitoring, evaluation and on-going revision of the policy; the only significant recommendation of this sort is that for a National Advisory Council on Language Policy (NAC) and subsidiary coordinating committees [SSCEA 1984; 6, 52, 78]. In addition, if these bodies are to develop and implement the national language policy, their task will be very large indeed and they will need an extensive secretariat not mentioned in the report. The policy ought, in fact, to be backed by a national language advisory centre of the sort proposed by the AFMLTA in its submission on a National Language Information and Research Centre [Ingram 1978b].

From the second and foreign language point of view, the problems identified in the English-L1 and adult literacy areas are so salient as to risk distracting from the rest of the report, as the initial press and media response to the report in December 1984 confirms. For applied linguists, the report was disappointing in that it failed to recognize the field of applied linguistics and, for instance, recommended that the traditional language departments in tertiary institutions undertake research in "second language acquisition and first language maintenance" whereas such departments generally do not have staff with relevant expertise and continue to be guilty of some of the worst language teaching that occurs in Australia [SSCEA 1984: 141, 175].

Related to this deficiency and equally disappointing is the treatment of teacher education. Though the recommendations made suggest the need for drastic reform of language teacher education, teacher education misses out on the comprehensive review that is needed if the education implications of the report are to be realized and no indication is given as to how the supply of teachers can be assured and the teachers' language and professional skills regularly updated. This lack of implementation guidelines reduces this and other recommendations to fine ideals, often heard previously but still not implemented.

The report on a national language policy by the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts has much to commend it and provides a useful mid-point in the preparation of a national language policy for Australia but it falls short, for the reasons already stated, of being such a policy though it is unlikely to be for this reason that the Federal Government has so far failed to indicate its position on the document. Whatever the reason, as indicated earlier Lo Bianco was commissioned in July 1986 to prepare a draft policy for the Federal Government. This has been completed but, because it is currently before Federal Cabinet and is, therefore, confidential, it cannot be cited here. There have, however, been some press reports and public meetings

[e.g., see ML Newsletter, No. 127, March 1987: 14] in which authoritative reference has been made to parts of the report. These suggest that Lo Bianco's report attempts to be structurally more adequate than the Senate Committee's document and attempts to provide a rationally based policy developing from the nature and needs of the society to policy recommendations and implementation. It lacks significant reference to evaluation as well as the structural and presentational rigour demanded by the AFMLTA submission [1982] and discussed in Section II of this paper. It seeks to be as comprehensive in scope as the Senate Committee's report but gives much more attention to concrete implementational recommendations. Often Lo Bianco has filled in gaps, not least with strong recommendations in the areas of language testing, increased language teaching in the Primary School, some compulsory second language learning, and the establishment of relatively cost-efficient structures to oversight, monitor and develop the national language policy. In particular, a National Advisory Council on Australia's Language Policy is recommended together with four Standing Committees on English and Learning, Aboriginal and Islander Languages, Languages other than English, and Language Services and the Comunication Disabled. A number of expert Centres in certain areas are recommended including, amongst others, Aboriginal languages, ESL and bilingual education, and a national clearinghouse on language teaching, research and information. It is proposed that a national language testing unit be a part of the ESL and bilingual education centre.

Lo Bianco's draft paper constitutes a reasonably coherent, practical, and insightful attempt to develop a national language policy and to have it successfully implemented and continuously re-assessed and updated. Its major deficiencies come from factors beyond the control of its author, viz., the imposition of an immense task to be completed by one person in just four to six months. Nevertheless, it provides a sound and comprehensive basis for further development.

IV LANGUAGE SKILLS IN HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT: SELECTED ASPECTS

This review of the background to Australia's development of a national language policy has emphasized the critical role of language in social and economic development in a multicultural, multilingual nation integrally involved with a multicultural and multilingual region. If the human resources of such a nation are to be developed, then due regard must be paid both to the diverse language and cultural heritage of the people and to the necessity to develop a proficiency in the nation's dominant language (or languages) that is sufficient to meet the people's needs and interests. If the nation is to develop economically and maintain an equal-status relationship with its neighbours, then its people must develop proficiency in the languages of the region and corollary understanding of their cultures. In addition, granted the international status of English and the fact that, today, it is an essential tool by which to gain access to modern technology and

knowledge, it could be argued that, as the largest English-L1 country in the Asian-Pacific region, Australia has an obligation and opportunity to assist in the provision of English learning opportunities. From the many issues that are relevant to such considerations, just three of particular personal interest to the present writer will be discussed further here, first, the need for better testing procedures, second, Australia's drive to export education, and, third, the role of professional organizations.

First, with respect to better testing procedures, it has already been argued that a multilingual society requires a fair, valid and reliable means by which to assess second language skills. The reasons for such assessment range widely from the payment of salary loadings for bilingual employees to vocational registration, entry to educational programmes, or liability in a court case. At present, it is rare to find such judgements being made validly and reliably and there is good evidence (as in some of the situations referred to earlier) that many non-native speakers suffer discrimination as a result, i.e., the human resources that they have to offer the nation are left underdeveloped or, in international programmes, students do not have their real needs identified and met or they are forced unnecessarily to take additional and costly language programmes. The AFMLTA in its submission on a national language policy [1982 and see Appendix A of this paper]. proposed that a system of accredited language testers backed by suitable courses should be set up analogous to the accreditation system for translators and interpreters. Such people would be available to advise both on an individual's language proficiency and the level of proficiency required for a particular purpose (e.g., to undertake a course of study or to do a certain job). Though the Senate Standing Committee inquiring into a national language policy [SSCEA 1984] failed to take up this point, it is reported that Lo Bianco has included in his draft policy for the government a proposal for a national testing unit that would be involved in the whole range of test activities including developing tests for academic, vocational and other purposes and assessing individual's proficiency in a second language. In addition, the Overseas Students Office of the Commonwealth Education Department currently has a project commissioned to review tests for private overseas students with a view to new procedures and probably the development of new, more valid and reliable tests.

Second, in its new drive to "export education", Australia is serving both its own ends and that of the region. Despite the problems Australia currently faces in matching its language education system to its own language needs, much of the activity that goes on in the area of applied linguistics (not least in methodology, course design and assessment) is well in accord with world trends and has received international recognition. In addition, as already observed, it is in Australia's own economic and diplomatic interest, and hopefully in the interest of the Asian-Pacific region, for Australia to seek a significant regional role in the teaching of English and applied linguistics. In fact, since 1985, Federal Government regulations and structures have been amended to encourage Australian tertiary institutions and private organizations to offer programmes to overseas students and an education section has been set up within the Australian Trade Commission to assist in promoting educational programmes. The new regulations recognize three categories of overseas students:

scholarship holders (on scholarships from Australian Government or other sources), subsidized students (for whom a certain number of places are allocated and who pay "visa fees" amounting at present to about 45% of the costs of the education they seek), and private students (who enrol on a full-fee basis). In addition, stringent quality control mechanisms have been built into the system to ensure that quality of education is maintained and that an institution's financial interest in offering places or courses to fee-paying overseas students does not adulterate the quality of what is offered either to Australians or to overseas students. Thus, for instance, fee structures have to be approved by the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, award courses involving overseas students require the same stringent accreditation procedures as do those aimed only at Australian students, and private or public institutions offering English courses must be accredited by the Overseas Students Office of the Federal Education Department.

Most tertiary institutions in Australia have responded to the Federal Government's encouragement to open their courses to overseas students and many have set up so-called ELICOS Centres offering English Language Intensive Courses to Overseas Students. One such example is the Brisbane College of Advanced Education, one of the largest CAE's in Australia, which has set up the Language Teaching Unit and Office for International Students to coordinate the offering of the College's existing courses to overseas students and to develop courses in both English and applied linguistics to offer to both overseas students and Australians. This Unit seeks to be somewhat different from other ELICOS centres in that it has the broad terms of reference "to promote the second language area through award and non-award courses, research and consultancy". In other words, its task goes beyond the teaching of English to include the teaching of applied linguistics and the undertaking of relevant research and consultancy. This has important implications for the nature of the staffing and the quality of the programmes it seeks to offer. Thus, in addition to regular teaching staff, it has sought to appoint senior staff with high qualifications, strong experience, and established reputations in the area. Though this adds significantly to the College's financial commitment to the activity, it is expected that it will be beneficial in terms of the quality of programmes offered and the research and consultancy undertaken. Not least, to ensure quality in the core English programmes, it is necessary to have, at least at the supervisory level, quality staff with the expertise and experience to provide leadership in course design, methodology and assessment. If such staff are to be recruited and retained, it is almost axiomatic that their responsibilities and opportunities must go beyond classroom-based language teaching per se (however important that is) to include what rightly or wrongly is generally held to be higher level activities such as research, consultancy, and the teaching of applied linguistics.

Consequently, the Brisbane CAE's Language Teaching Unit and Office for International Students offers programmes in three categories:

1. A variety of English courses including short integrated language and tourism packages for holiday-makers and tourists, vacation courses for overseas institutions, on-going support for students entering other College

courses, and standard 10- to 15-week courses in English, English for Special Purposes, and pre-sessional English for Academic Purposes.

2. Courses in applied linguistics as demand or interest suggests are appropriate and including, for example, courses in language policy-making, testing, communicative methods, advanced studies in TESL methodology, course design, and so on.

3. Research, Development and Consultancy.

In all these areas, the emphasis is on high quality programmes that are both needs-based (i.e., directed at identifying and meeting the actual practical needs of the students in each class) and theory-based (i.e., not "theoretical" but well founded in the current state of knowledge of the most effective and efficient means by which to develop language proficiency or teaching skills).

Third, professional language teacher organizations have, I believe, a major role to play in maximizing the language contribution to human resource development (though one must carefully distinguish professional from political and industrial organizations). At any rate, the professional organizations have played important roles in Australia where, for example, much of the initiative for and impetus towards the development of a national language policy has come from the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations and its affiliates. Language teachers are the pivots on which much of the language contribution to human resource development depends and professional language teacher organizations have a major role in assisting language teachers to make that contribution as appropriate, effective and efficient as possible. Not least, independent professional associations relieve governments of some of the onerous and costly burden of providing opportunities for continuous professional development, assist teachers to see and accept some personal responsibility for their own professional development, provide a professionally interested and competent means by which to monitor needs, provide part of the on-going evaluation that is an essential part of the structure of successful language policy-making, and provide apolitical expert bodies that can be called upon by governments and others to advise on language, language policy and language teaching matters. In the Australian context where foreign language teaching has experienced considerable difficulties arising from low student numbers and a false sense of irrelevance, the professional organizations affiliated to national and international bodies serve a further vital purpose, that of reinforcing the notion of belonging to a viable, worthy and respected worldwide profession. Thus, in Australia, there are Modern Language Teachers Associations in all States and Territories some of which have regional sub-branches and all of which are

affiliated to the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations which, in turn, is affiliated to and actively involved in the World Federation of Modern Language Associations, the Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes.

V CONCLUSION:

This paper has sought to consider the development of a national language policy and to relate it to issues of social and economic development by considering Australia as a case study. It argued for a rigorous and rational approach to policy-making with the starting-point in the structure and needs of the society and its internal and international relationships. These, in turn, lead to the identification of goals and objectives, actual policy recommendations, detailed implementation, and evaluation leading to policy review. The lack of an explicit policy in Australia was shown to have contributed to economic problems and a failure to utilize and develop all the human resources in the society. The history of the move to develop a national language policy for Australia was traced and brief reference made to three aspects of human resource development, viz., the need for a valid and reliable approach to assessing both a person's language skills and the language demands of an activity, Australia's new efforts to "export education" (especially in the form of courses in English and applied linguistics) as a (less than altruistic) contribution to human resource development in the Asian-Pacific region, and the role of professional language teacher organizations. If language policy-making is to contribute effectively and productively to human resource development, it must be comprehensive, forward-thinking rather than just responsive to popular demand, insightful of the nature of language especially as a social phenomenon and a means to international communication, and it must be rigorous in structure and ideational development.

REFERENCES

Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (AFMLTA), 1982. Submission on Aspects of a National Language Policy, submission to the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts. mimeograph

Bostock, William. 1973. "Monolingualism in Australia". In The Australian Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 2, June 1973, pp. 39-52.

Cameron, R.J. 1983. Language Survey, Australia, May 1983 (Preliminary). Canberra : Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Cameron, R.J. 1985. Yearbook Australia 1985, Number 69. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Campbell, W.J. et al. 1984. A Review of the Commonwealth English as a Second Language Program. Canberra: Commonwealth Schools Commission.

Campbell, W.J. et al. 1986. Towards Active Voice: Report of the Committee of Review of the Adult Migrant Education Program. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Commonwealth Advisory Committee. 1970. The Teaching of Asian Languages and Cultures in Australia. Canberra : Commonwealth of Australia.

Department of Education. 1976. Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Migrant Languages in Schools. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Commonwealth Department of Education. 1982. "Towards a National Language Policy". Canberra : Commonwealth Department of Education. mimeograph.

Commonwealth Department of Education. 1986. National Survey of Language Learning in Australian Schools 1983. Canberra : Australian Government Publishing Service.

Council of Chief State School Officers. 1986. "International Dimensions of Education : Position Paper and Recommendations for Action". In Foreign Language Annals, Vol. 19, No. 3, May 1986, pp. 243-247.

Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers. 1982. "Recommendation No. R (82) 18 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States Concerning Modern Languages". mimeograph.

D'Anglejan, A. and G.R. Tucker. 1971. "Academic Report : The St. Lambert Program of Home-School Language Switch". In The Modern Language Journal, Vol. LV, No.2, February 1971, pp. 99-102.

De Avila, Edward et al. 1981. Improving Cognition: A Multicultural Approach. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Di Pietro, Robert J. 1980. "Filling the Elementary Curriculum with Languages : What are the Effects?". In Foreign Language Annals, Vol.13, No.2, April 1980, pp.115-123.

Economic Planning Advisory Council (EPAC). 1986. International Trade Policy. Canberra : Commonwealth of Australia.

Ellyard, Peter. 1985. Remaking a State - Education and Technology in South Australia. Adelaide: Ministry of Technology.

Federation of British Industries. 1962. Foreign Languages in Industry. London : Federation of British Industries.

Federation of British Industries. 1964. Foreign Language Needs of Industry. London : Federation of British Industries.

Fradd, Sandra. 1982. "Bilingualism, Cognitive Growth, and Divergent Thinking Skills". In Educational Forum, Vol.46, No.4, pp.469-474.

Galbally Review. 1978 - see below "Review of Post-Arrival Programs..."

Hancock, C.R. 1977. "Second Language Study and Intellectual Development". In Foreign Language Annals, Vol.10, No.1, 1977, pp. 75-79.

Hyltenstam, Kenneth and Manfred Pienemann, eds. 1985. Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.

Ingram, D.E. 1978. "The Case for a National Language Policy", invited paper to the 1978 Annual Conference of the MLTASA, Adelaide, 27 October 1978, reprinted in Babel, Vol. 15, No.1, 1979, pp.3-16.

Ingram, D.E. 1978a. "An Applied Linguistic Study of Advanced Language Learning", thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy submitted to the University of Essex, Colchester, England. 1978.

Ingram, D.E. 1978b. "A National Language Information and Research Centre", submission to the Commonwealth Government from the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, 1978 rev. 1984. mimeograph.

Ingram, D.E. 1979. "Aspects of Personality Development for Bilingualism". In Afendras 1980 : 25-53.

Ingram, D.E. 1980. "The Future of Community Languages in Australia", paper to the Sixth Panaustralian Conference on Modern Greek Studies, Adelaide CAE, 29-31 August, 1980.

Ingram, D.E. 1980a. "Languages and the Core Curriculum". In Babel, Vol.16, No.3, 1980, pp.4-19.

Ingram, D.E. 1985. "Assessing Proficiency". In Hyltenstam and Pienemann 1985: 215-276.

Ingram, D.E. 1986. "Languages and the Export Economy", paper to the Sixth Biennial National Languages Conference of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, Adelaide, 5-9 September, 1986.

Inman, Marianne. 1986. "Bilingualism in Business : Past, Present, and Future". In ERIC/CLL News Bulletin, Vol. 9, No. 2, March 1986, pp. 3-6,11.

Kelly, Paul. 1986. "The Demise of the Lucky Country", article in The Week-end Australian, 26-27 April, 1986, pp. 15, 18.

Landry, R.G. 1973. "The Enhancement of Figural Creativity through Second Language Learning at the Elementary School Level". In Foreign Language Annals, Vol.7, No.1, 1973, pp.111-115.

Landry, R.G. 1974 "A Comparison of Second Language Learners and Monolinguals on Divergent Thinking Tasks at the Elementary School Level". In Modern Language Journal, Vol.58, Nos.i and ii, 1974, pp.10-15.

Martin, J.I. 1972. "Migrants: equality and ideology", Meredith Memorial Lecture, 1972. Melbourne: Latrobe University.

Perkins, James A. 1979. "Report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies". In Foreign Language Annals, Vol. 12, No. 6, December 1979, pp. 457-464.

Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants (Galbally Review). 1978. Migrant Services and Programs. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Samuels, D.D. and R.J. Griffore. 1979. "The Plattsburgh French Immersion Program: Its Influence on Intelligence and Self-Esteem". In Language Learning, Vol.29, No.1, June 1979, pp.45-52.

Schools Commission. 1978. Report for the Triennium 1979-81. Canberra: Schools Commission.

Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts (SSCEA). 1984. A National Language Policy. Canberra : Australian Government Publishing Service.

Simon, Paul. 1980. "Is there an Interpreter in the House?". In Annals of Scholarship, Vol. 1, No. 3, Summer 1980, pp. 1-6.

Swain, Merrill and James Cummins. 1979. "Bilingualism, Cognitive Functioning and Education". In Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts, Vol.12, No.1, January 1979, pp.4-18.

Teague, Baden. 1985. "A 'National Language Policy' for Australia and its Implications for the Development of Bahasa Indonesia", paper to the First National Convention of the Indonesian Cultural and Educational Institute, Latrobe University, Melbourne, 20 May, 1985. mimeograph.

Teague, Baden. 1986. A National Language Policy: Selected Speeches. Canberra: mimeographed collection.

Titone, R. 1978. "Some Psychological Aspects of Multilingual Education". In International Review of Education, Vol.24, No.3, 1978, pp.283-293.

Ure, Jean. 1980. "Bilingualism and Achievement in School". In Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, Vol.1, No.3, 1980, pp.253-260.

Wykes, Olive and M.G. King. 1968. The Teaching of Foreign Languages in Australia. Melbourne : Australian Council for Educational Research.

APPENDIX A

Excerpts from the AFMLTA's Submission on a National Language Policy [AFMLTA 1982].

The following tables are extracted from the submission on a national language policy made to the Australian Senate's Standing Committee on Education and the Arts by the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations [AFMLTA 1982]. Each table was preceded by a section describing the social context within which the proposals exist. Sub-Section III.C.5.b on "Proficiency Assessment" is reproduced here in full but just two of twenty-seven pages of Section III.E.2 on "Language Teaching" are presented.

III.C.5.b Policy and Implementation Recommendations: Proficiency Assessment

NEEDS (Societal and Individual)	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS	RATIONALE	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS
1. That the proficiency of non-native speakers of a language be fairly, validly and reliably established for whatever purpose is required (e.g. entry to educational institutions, employment, vocational registration, legal responsibility, citizenship, etc.).	1. To provide means by which non-native speakers can have their proficiency fairly, validly and reliably measured and stated. 2. To make advice available to institutions, employers, vocational registration authorities on language proficiency requirements.	1. That a system of language proficiency assessment be established to which persons wishing their own or others' language proficiency to be assessed could have recourse. 2. That all language teachers be given basic training in language testing, especially proficiency assessment, in their pre-service courses and that opportunities be given in all teacher education institutions for specialist training in language testing (perhaps as part of other graduate programmes).	1. That a central language testing authority be established (perhaps as part of the national language institute discussed subsequently) to provide information and advice on language proficiency levels and assessment and to act as an ultimate place of appeal for persons who believe they have suffered discrimination on the basis of unjustified assumptions about their language proficiency. 2. That a system of accredited language proficiency testers be established and regulated by an accreditation authority (similar to NAATI for translators) that would ensure that accredited testers had appropriate levels of training and skills in the relevant language and in language testing. 3. That at least one College or university in each State and Territory be funded to provide	1. These needs exist not only in English but in any language used in Australia or by Australians internationally. 2. If citizenship, educational and employment opportunities, vocational registration, legal provisions, etc. depend on a person's proficiency in a language, then it is a question of fundamental justice that that person should have access to fair, valid and reliable assessment. 3. An accredited tester's assessment could have major implications for the users of the results (non-native speakers, employers etc.) and assurance is needed that statements of a non-native speaker's proficiency are as fair, valid and reliable as possible. 4. "Direct tests" such as the Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings for general proficiency provide the	1. Establishment of a central language testing authority. 2. Compilation of a register of accredited language testers. 3. Formation of a clearinghouse on language tests. 4. Preparation and teaching of short courses to train language testers. 5. Use of the proficiency testing system by vocational registration boards for advice and referral of applicants. 6. Staff lists from migrant education centres showing the employment of accredited testers. 7. Lists of cases handled by accredited testers.

NEEDS (Societal and Individual)	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS	RATIONALE	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS
			3. (cont.) for trained second language teachers short (possibly 3 month) courses in language testing leading to their being registered as accredited language testers. 4. That each migrant education centre include on its staff at least one person accredited as a language tester. 5. That the central testing authority maintain a register of accredited testers and a clearing-house on language tests. 6. That the central testing authority collect and disseminate information on language testing, testers, and services available. 7. That all pre-service and graduate programmes in second language teacher education include units on second language testing (including proficiency assessment).	4. (cont.) most useful way of assessing and stating proficiency but their validity and reliability depend on the competence of the tester. 5. The accredited testers and the central testing authority would be available for advisory services as well as testing. 6. Accredited language testers may be employed full time on language testing (depending on a Centre's needs) but would, in general, be teachers with accreditation in testing and available to be called upon when their specialist skills were needed.	8. Dissemination of information on testing in newsletters and other publications from the central testing authority. 9. Existence of units on language testing (including proficiency assessment) in pre-service language teacher education programmes and in graduate programmes.

NEEDS (Societal and Individual)	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS	RATIONALE	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS
	3. To make available test instruments for all purposes in all languages for which there is need in Australia.	1. That a major test development exercise be undertaken to develop and validate proficiency measuring instruments for those purposes and those languages needed in Australia.	1. That the central testing authority or existing organizations such as the Commonwealth Education Department or ARGC be provided with research funds to distribute to researchers willing to develop and validate tests. 2. That, in particular, tests be developed to measure proficiency (practical language skills) in . child learners of ESL and other languages . "specific register" proficiency in priority vocational areas in priority languages. 3. That the use of first language tests with second language learners be outlawed.	1. The Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings have been developed and validated for measuring the practical language skills of adolescent and adult learners of English and other languages. The ASLPR is designed to measure general proficiency. 2. It is possible that an instrument such as the ASLPR could be adapted for use with children and in "special purpose" areas of the language but the necessary research has yet to be done. 3. The research evidence is unanimous and indisputable that first language instruments fail to assess validly the proficiency of second language learners (and vice versa).	1. Listing of research and development contracts let. 2. Publication of new tests. 3. A growing match between the tests available through the clearinghouse and the requests and real needs for tests.

III.E.2 Policy and Implementation Recommendations: Language Teaching

NEEDS (Societal and Individual)	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS	RATIONALE	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS
1. Most Australians to be bilingual or multilingual in English and a variety of other languages. 2. Adequate supply of bilingual workers to meet Australia's real national and international communication needs. 3. Improved communication and understanding between all linguistic and cultural groups in Australia.	1. To ensure that all Australians learn English to their level of need. 2. To strongly encourage all children and adults to learn at least one other language to a practically useful level of proficiency. 3. To foster the concept of Australians as a bilingual or multilingual people. 4. To encourage recognition by all Australians of the worth of all Australian	1. See Sections III.B and D. 1. That employment and salary incentives be provided to encourage people to become bilingual. 2. That education systems and Secondary Schools themselves encourage students to opt for language study and to continue it at least to the level of Survival Proficiency (1+ on the ASLPR).	1. See Sections III.B and D. 1. See Section III.C.2, Goal 3, Policy Recommendation No. 1 and Section III.C.3. 1. That, when the "elective lines" or competing subject options in schools are drawn up, languages appear on several lines and not only against what, rightly or wrongly, are regarded by many students as "easy options". 2. That either languages be regarded as part of the compulsory core of subjects or the notion of any compulsory subjects (for whatever purpose) be abolished. 3. That matriculation regulations and tertiary entrance requirements give a positive weighting in favour of languages.	1. See Sections III.B and D. 1. Encouragement is preferable to compulsion and the form proposed meets other goals discussed in Section III.C. 1. In very many schools, the elective system is such that languages compete against biology, sport or other subjects regarded, rightly or wrongly, as "easy options". As inherently and inevitably "difficult" and time-consuming subjects, languages lose out when placed against what many students consider to be subjects in which higher grades are more readily obtained. 2. While the argument of "democratic choice" is frequently applied to languages, it is not applied to English, Maths., and Science (at least by university faculties) with the result that, by the time students have taken	1. See Sections III.B snd D. 1. See Section III.C.2, Goal 3. 1. Survey of school timetabling policies. 2. Abolition of all compulsory subjects or inclusion of languages amongst them. 3. Re-instatement of languages in tertiary entrance requirements or special weighting for them in matriculation regulations. 4. A minimum of 75% of matriculation students studying a language

NEEDS (Societal and Individual)	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS	RATIONALE	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS
4. Improved cross-cultural attitudes amongst all Australians and the elimination of all forms of ethnocentricity, xenophobia, or racism. 5. Creation of a cohesive, harmonious and culturally and linguistically rich society in Australia. 6. Positive recognition of the worth of all Australian languages and of the desirability of being bilingual or multilingual.	4. (cont.) languages and of the desirability of being bilingual or multilingual.		4. That, if incentives such as those proposed do not result, within 5 years, in a minimum of 75% of students learning a second language to Survival Proficiency level (i.e. to matriculation) language study be made compulsory and re-introduced in tertiary entrance requirements.	2. (cont.) all the compulsory subjects needed to keep their subsequent options open, they have little or no room for languages. 3. Evidence cited earlier (e.g. Swain and Cummins 1979, Eddy 1978 and 1981) shows that students who have studied another language have better cognitive skills and attitudes and make better academic progress. 4. The workload involved in formal study of another language is undoubtedly heavier than in most school subjects and matriculation regulations should recognize this fact. 5. Surveys cited in Section II show that the vast majority of the Australian people support the notion that language learning should be strongly encouraged or compulsory. 6. The U.S. President's Commission advocated the re-introduction of language requirements at all levels	

APPENDIX B

Excerpt from A NATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY

Recommendations on the Teaching of Languages other than English in the document "A National Language Policy" [SSCEA 1984, pp.230-231].

Teaching Languages other than English

Recommendation 76: Education authorities should establish more bilingual programs, and evaluate their outcomes as a guide to possible further expansion. Provisions need to be made for teacher education for bilingual programs. (paragraph 11.40).

Recommendation 77: Prior to any extension of pre-school language programs, research should be undertaken into the extent, nature and effectiveness of existing pre-school language programs in Australia. (paragraph 11.44).

Recommendation 78: The learning of languages at primary school level should be substantially increased to give more children the opportunity to maintain their home languages or to acquire other languages. (paragraph 11.47)

Recommendation 79: Where possible the introduction of primary school language programs should be catered for within normal staff allocations. Recognising, however, that an increase in language teaching cannot be achieved without some resource reallocation and curriculum adjustment, action should be concentrated in the key areas of need, namely:

- the reliable supply of qualifies staff;
- appropriate teacher training;
- provisions for continuity of study at secondary school;
- adequate supplies of teaching materials. (paragraph 11.53)

Recommendation 80: All secondary students should experience language learning for a minimum period of one year, at levels suitable to their abilities. (paragraph 11.62)

Recommendation 81: Secondary students of lesser academic ability should not be required to continue language learning for periods longer than a year until language programs suitable for students of all ability levels have been fully developed and shown to be operating successfully. (paragraph 11.62)

Recommendation 82: Where languages are elective subjects, they should be grouped with subjects which make comparable intellectual demands. (paragraph 11.66)

Recommendation 83: Education authorities should ensure that only qualified specialists are appointed to teach languages within the school system. The Committee is aware that providing sufficient numbers of specialists will take time and that there may be delays in implementing this recommendation. Such delays, however, should be kept to a minimum. (paragraph 11.71)

Recommendation 84: The Commonwealth Government should consider an amendment to the income tax legislation such that additional expenses incurred by language teachers to enable them to live or to study in a country in which the language they teach is widely spoken, can be regarded as a taxation deduction. (paragraph 11.73)

Recommendation 85: Tertiary institutions and education authorities should take steps to increase the range of opportunities for overseas experience available through arrangements such as scholarships, assistantships and teacher exchanges. Education authorities should ensure that employment conditions for language teachers give ample opportunity and encouragement to those wishing to gain appropriate overseas experience. (paragraph 11.73).

Recommendation 86: In order to diversify the study of languages in schools, State Higher Education Boards and education authorities should act jointly to broaden the range of options in languages and language teaching methodologies which are provided in teacher education courses. (paragraph 11.76)

Recommendation 87: Education authorities should identify those languages of major relevance to the majority of schools. Funds available for the teaching of languages should be directed mainly to such languages although a substantial portion should also be reserved for other languages. (paragraph 11.92)

Recommendation 88: The Curriculum Development Centre should investigate the requirements for teaching materials for all languages of major relevance to Australian schools, and identify priority areas of need. Grants for projects should be allocated accordingly. (paragraph 11.100)

Recommendation 89: Funds made available for language teaching programs through the Commonwealth Schools Commission's Multicultural Education Program and the multicultural education element of the Projects of National Significance Program should be available for all languages relevant to schools. (paragraph 11.100)

Recommendation 90: The important complementary role played by ethnic schools in the field of language teaching should be recognised by continued financial support from the Commonwealth and State Governments. (paragraph 11.110)

Recommendation 91: Whenever possible, opportunities should be provided to combine the study of languages with study in other discipline areas. Recognising the importance of language proficiency, tertiary institutions should also investigate ways of raising the levels of proficiency

achieved by language graduates. These may include alternative methodologies or course arrangements. (paragraph 11.132)

Recommendation 92: Language departments in tertiary institutions should consider reassessing their research priorities so that greater emphasis is placed on studies - particularly those of an applied nature - into second language acquisition and first language maintenance at school and post-secondary levels. (paragraph 11.133)

Recommendation 93: The level of participation of colleges of advanced education in the training of language teachers should be increased. (paragraph 11.138)

Recommendation 94: The Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission's policy on provision for language learning in the tertiary sector should take account of the need to cater for all languages of importance to Australia. An organisational model should be developed for this purpose. The policy should recognise the labour intensive nature of language study at tertiary level and take this into account in the allocation of resources. (paragraph 11.145)

Recommendation 95: The Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, through the TAFE Council, should survey language teaching provisions in institutions of further education, to provide a basis for more effective planning for the teaching of languages in these institutions. Such surveys should be conducted periodically. (paragraph 11.160)

[SSCEA 1984, pp.230-231]